

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2, 7, 8 and 10 have been amended. Claim 11 is new. Basis for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Thill, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,087,990). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 8 has been amended to define the metal attachment plate as being integral with a vehicle body. In Thill, the radiating element 18 and the ground plate 22 are disposed on the same side (upper side in the figures) of roof 12 of the vehicle. Thus, Thill fails to disclose, teach or suggest the radiating element as being on one side of the vehicle body and the ground plate 22 being on the opposite side of the vehicle body as is now defined in amended Claim 8.

Thus, Applicants believe Claim 8 patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claim 9 which depends from Claim 8, is also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 6 and 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thill, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,087,990) in view of Janky, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,918,183). Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Janky, et al. in view of Thill, et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The Examiner agrees that Thill, et al. fails to disclose, teach or suggest having the antenna mounted in a hole defined by the vehicle with the radiating element being spaced in one direction from one surface of the vehicle and the ground plate being spaced in the opposite direction from an opposite surface of the vehicle body. The Examiner then goes to Janky, et al. in an attempt to find this limitation.

Janky, et al. discloses a vehicle body which defines a concavity 32 which has a through hole formed in its bottom for routing the antenna wire. Janky, et al. is silent as to the position of its radiating element, its ground plate and the vehicle plate. The combination of Janky, et al. with Thill would place the antenna of Thill, et al. in well 32 of Janky, et al. but this would not locate the radiating element spaced in one direction from one surface of the vehicle and the ground plate spaced in an opposite direction from an opposite surface of the vehicle.

Clearly, the pocket 32 in Janky, et al. is not a through hole and only alters or makes uneven the one surface of the vehicle body by forming a pocket in it. The bottom of the pocket 32 is still on the same surface as the upper surface of the vehicle body 34. There is no part of antenna 42, 44 in Janky, et al. which is located in the hole below the upper surface of the vehicle body. Thus, adding Thill, et al. to Janky, et al. will not dispose the two elements as they are defined by independent Claims 1, 7 and 10 of the present invention. As shown in the figures of the present invention, the present invention has the elements spaced in the through hole in opposite directions with respect to the surfaces of the vehicle body and as shown in the figures with a pocket, this relationship is maintained. Thill, et al. discloses a system similar to prior art

Figure 6A and 6B and combining Janky, et al. only locates the antenna within a pocket, it does not locate it with elements located spaced from opposite surfaces of a vehicle body.

Thus, Applicants believe Claims 1, 7 and 10, as amended, patentably distinguish over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 2-6, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

Claim 4 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 4 depended from Claim 3 which depended from Claim 1. New Claim 11 is a new independent claim which combines previously presented Claims 1, 3 and 4 and is thus believed to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 26, 2005

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg